

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES WASHINGTON. D.C. 20548

03/1562

FILE: B-181046

DATE:

NOV 10 1974

WYLLE LEGISTON

Albert L. Medrich - Constructive travel costs

DIGEST:

TO THE TO SEE THE WARRENCE OF THE PARTY OF T

Employee of Department of Commerce who used his privately owned automobile while on official business away from his headquarters, and who was authorized to use either privately owned automobile or rental car, should be allowed reimbursement on mileage basis and not on basis of constructive cost of rental car since statute and regulations provide that reimbursement for travel expenses when privately owned automobile is used is limited to a fixed mileage rate. Moreover, mileage reimbursement may not exclud constructive cost of travel by commen carrier since the use of the privately owned automobile was for personal convenience.

This action is at the request of an authorized certifying officer for an arrange decision as to whether a reclaim voucher in the amount of \$79.86 approximating the constructive cost of a rental car by Mr. Albert L. Hedrich, a amployee of the Department of Commerce, may be certified for payment.

The record shows that by Travel Order No. 303260 dated June 13, 1373, w. Heirich was authorized to travel from Hashington, D. C., to Boulder, miorado, and return, in order that he could attend technical program discussions in Boulder. Mr. Hedrich was also authorized to take annual leave from June 15, 1973, to June 24, 1973. The travel order allowed Mr. Hedrich was either his own automobile or a rented car in connection with the messary business travel. Accordingly, Mr. Hedrich left his residence in missa, Virginia, on June 15, 1973, using his privately owned car, and remined in annual leave status from that date until he arrived in Boulder, mioralo, on June 24, 1973, whereupon he performed the official business regired of him. Mr. Hedrich returned to McLean on July 1, 1973.

While he was in Boulder, Mr. Hedrich drove his own car 93 miles on Fileial business. Mr. Hedrich now claims reimburgement for the constructive cost of a rental tar for this travel performed in Boulder. The constructive cost for the above travel as estimated by a sample receipt from

7685267 (1845)62

131246

se Continental Bantal Car Agency would have been \$13 par day plus 13 cents er Mile.

the certifying officer, citing our decision at 5-163637 July 15, 1970. riginally discllowed Mr. Bedrich's claim for the constructive cost of a will car and instead allowed Mr. Nedrich 11 cents per mile for the travel arformed in Boulder. The constructive cost of air fare from Washington to salder and return was also allowed. The now requests our decision as to or incality of paying the constructive car rental costs.

mas argument is made on Hr. Hedrich's behalf by Hr. Russell J. Jones. will Administrative Officer, in a removandum dated Docember 27, 1973, to . Jones P. Monser, Chief, Accounting Division, Rational Bureau of Standards. out 3-169637, supra, does not apply in Mr. Hedrich's case as that decision Wists to an employee on furnorary duty with a comparison in use of arivetely-comed automobile versus mental of a occurreial vehicle." Hr. Jones cross further:

"A search of applicable did travel regulations shows no restrictions as to method of reindurement, i.e. in figuring constructive costs, to take parts of actual costs and apply them to constructive costs. Reference is made to the Handbook of Travel Policies and P. Scalares, U. S. Popartment of Courseres, Dhibit 5.03-2. Traveler cannot be penalized by taking one portion of constructive cost and not allowing either all of actual or all of constructive."

w. Joses indicates that since restal of a motor vehicle was sutherized, it fillows that the full constructive rental cost is payable.

The provision in the law relating to relegarating Government apployees to travel by privately owerd automobile is found at 5 United States Code, "Aftend it atabes in part on follows:

"(a) Under regulations prescribed under section 5707 of this title, an employee or other individual performing service for the Covernment, who is engaged on official business inside or outside his devignated post of duty or place of service, is entitled to not in excess of-

到到外

"(2) Li conta a mile for the use of a privately owned automobile or airplane;

me epplicable regulations implementing the above law are found in the fateral Property Management Regulations (PRR) 101-7, May 1, 1973. Section 1-4.1.a of PPFR 101-7 states in part as follows:

the Government uso privately oxacd notor vehicles or sirplanes in the conduct of official business within or outside their designated posts of duty or planes of service and such use is sutherized or approved as sivantageous to the Government or as an authorized or approved exercise of the esployre's preference, payment shall be made on a mileage basis unless payment on an actual expense basis is specifically sutherized by lav."

It is clear from the shove that when an employee such as Mr. Hedrich is assigned temporarily away from his headquarters and uses his private automobile on official business, the Government whall only reimburse the employee on a mileage basis of up to 12 cents a mile. In this case II cents a sile has been determined by the authorities as supropriate reimbursement. There is no allowance in these circumstances for actual expenses other than for parking fees, ferry fares and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls. 5 United States Code 5704(b). Who authority exists for reimbursement for the use of a privately owned vehicle shows the maximum imposed by statute as set out in section 5704(a). Although Mr. Hedrich was authorized to use a rented car and he would have been reimbursed for the use of a rented car had he in fact used one, since he used his privately caned vehicle, he may only be reimbursed for such use within the statutory maximum as set out at 5 U.S.C. 5104(a), supra. Our above-cited decision, 2-16-7637, and our decision 2-160452, Jenuary 26, 1967, clearly state this principle.

Although the record is not clear, it appears it is claimed that Mr. Hedrich is being penalized because reimburstment of his travel costs is Boulder is limited to actual rileage whereas his Weshington to Boulder portion of the trip is computed at the constructive air fare which is less than the actual mileage. On Mr. Hedrich's travel order it is noted that

FLICKE

of a private automobile is both advantageous to the Government and for extremience of the traveler. However, since annual leave was also exceed on the travel order from June 15, 1973, through June 24, 1973, we conclude that the use of the privately owned automobile was for Reirich's personal convenience. Section 1-4,3 of FMR 101-7 provides part as follows:

* * * khen use of privately owned conveyance is in lieu of common carrier transportation. Menever a privately owned conveyance is used for official purposes as a matter of personal preference in lieu of common carrier transportation under 1-2.2d, payment for such travel shall be node on the tasis of the actual travel performed, computed under 1-4.1 at the mileage rate prescribed in 1-4.2a plus the per diem allowable for the actual travel. The total allowable shall be limited to the total constructive cost of appropriate common carrier transportation including constructive per diem by that method of transportation. * * * *

person, under the above-quoted regulation it was required that Mr. Hedrich's mixturement for the Washington to Ecolder and return travel by privately and automobile be limited to the constructive cost of common carrier transportation.

Accordingly, the reclaim voucher may not be certified for payment.

30000

Comptroller General of the United States